

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

RUTH T. MCLEAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

800 DC, LLC,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:

3:19-cv-17310-BRM-LHG

CASE MANAGEMENT

Clarkson S. Fisher Building & U.S. Courthouse
402 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608
January 7, 2020
Commencing at 10:00 a.m.

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:

RUTH T. MCLEAN
P.O. Box 137
Plainsboro, NJ 08536
Pro se Plaintiff

KRAVIS & WURGAFT, PC
BY: MATTHEW A. WURGAFT, ESQUIRE
201 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
For the Defendant

Megan McKay-Soule, Official Court Reporter
megansoule430@gmail.com
(215) 779-6437

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript
produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 (PROCEEDINGS held in open court before The Honorable
2 BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI, United States District Judge, on January
3 7, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.)

4 THE COURT: What's your name?

5 MS. MCLEAN: Ruth Thompson McLean.

6 THE COURT: There's a motion pending.

7 MS. MCLEAN: Yes.

8 THE COURT: This going to be the argument.

9 MS. MCLEAN: Yes. I'm here as an American national.

10 THE COURT: Can you step up? Because I can't hear
11 you.

12 MS. MCLEAN: I'm here as an American national. I
13 need to make my statement from here. Can you hear me now?

14 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

15 MS. MCLEAN: So I'm here as an American national.
16 I'm here as a special appearance. I'm here under the Treaty
17 of Peace and Friendship. I'm here peacefully to settle a
18 constitutional matter. That's my status in this court.

19 THE COURT: Would you like to be heard on the merits?
20 There's a motion --

21 MS. MCLEAN: Yes. Yes, sir.

22 THE COURT: But you need to come up.

23 MS. MCLEAN: Yes. I'm coming up.

24 THE COURT: Okay. We are on the record. Counsel,
25 your appearance, please.

1 MR. WURGAFT: Thank you, Your Honor. Matthew
2 Wurgaft, Law Offices of Kravis & Wurgaft for the defendant 800
3 DC.

4 THE COURT: Ma'am, your status has been recognized.

5 MS. MCLEAN: Thank you.

6 THE COURT: Your name for the record, please.

7 MS. MCLEAN: Ruth Thompson McLean.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 You may be seated. Before this Court is the
10 defendant's -- you can be seated -- motion for summary
11 judgment. Actually, a motion to dismiss pursuant to 12(b)(1)
12 and 12(b)(6). This Court notes that there was an application
13 for a preliminary injunction that this Court heard in October.
14 Specifically, on October 16th. At that time the Court denied
15 the application for preliminary injunction and set forth the
16 facts pled in the plaintiff's complaint at length. The Court
17 incorporates that recitation of the facts into this motion.
18 That motion resulted in an order denying the application,
19 which was ECF 18. This motion followed.

20 It's noted at the oral argument of the prior motion the
21 Court considered plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief and
22 denied that relief as her claims failed to demonstrate the
23 likelihood of success based on Rooker-Feldman.

24 This is a motion to dismiss. The Court will entertain
25 this under 12(b)(6). In deciding a motion to dismiss under

1 12(b)(6), the district court is required to accept as true all
2 the factual allegations in the complaint and draw all
3 inferences in the facts alleged in a light most favorable to
4 the plaintiff. *Phillips* 515 F.3d at 228. A complaint
5 attacked by 12(b)(6) to dismiss does not meet the factual
6 allegations. *Bell Atlantic v. Twombly* 550 U.S. 544.

7 Plaintiff has an obligation to provide grounds for the
8 entitlement of relief if the relief requires more than labels
9 and conclusions in a formulaic recitation of the elements of a
10 cause of action. That is *Twombly* citing to *Papasan v. Alleyne*
11 478 U.S. 256. A Court is not bound to accept as true the
12 legal conclusions as factual allegations. *Papasan* at 286.
13 Instead, assuming the factual allegations in the complaint are
14 true, the factual allegations must be enough to rise to a
15 right for relief above the speculative level.

16 To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must
17 contain sufficient factual matters accepted as true to state a
18 claim for that relief as plausible on its face. *Ashcroft v.*
19 *Iqbal* 556 U.S. 622 citing to *Twombly*. A claim has facial
20 plausibility when the pleaded factual content allows the Court
21 to draw the reasonable inference that a defendant is liable
22 for the misconduct alleged.

23 Under 12(b)(1) permits dismissal of a complaint for
24 lack of subject matter jurisdiction. In evaluating this
25 motion, no presumptive truthfulness attaches to plaintiff's

1 allegations and the existence of disputed material facts will
2 not preclude the trial court from evaluating for itself the
3 merits of jurisdictional claims. *Mortensen v. First Federal*
4 *Savings and Loan* 549 F.2d 844. Here, the genesis of the
5 defendant's motion is that this matter is precluded under the
6 Rooker-Feldman doctrine which derives from 28 U.S.C. 1257 and
7 basically states: Final judgment or decrees rendered by the
8 highest court of a state in which a decision could be had may
9 be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the
10 validity of a treaty or statute the United States is drawn in
11 question or where the validity of a statute or any state is
12 drawn in question on the ground of it being repugnant to the
13 constitution treaties or laws of the United States.

14 In Rooker-Feldman a party to a state court action that
15 has been affirmed by the state Supreme Court brought a bill in
16 equity in the federal district court seeking to have a state
17 court judgment declared null and void as being in violation of
18 the constitution. In rejecting the federal action the Court
19 explained it affirmatively appeals from the bill that the
20 judgment was rendered in course wherein the circuit court had
21 jurisdiction of both the subject matter of the parties, that a
22 full hearing was had, that the judgment was responsive to the
23 issues and that it was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the
24 state on appeal.

25 Here the defendant argues that the Rooker-Feldman

1 doctrine applies for several reasons. Number one, there was a
2 Michigan state court proceeding. Number two, there was a New
3 Jersey state court proceeding. And number three, there was a
4 bankruptcy matter that was later withdrawn by the plaintiff.

5 Counsel, I'll hear your argument.

6 MR. WURGAFT: Thank you, Your Honor. Respectfully,
7 Your Honor, this Court does not have subject matter
8 jurisdiction of the plaintiff's claims. As Your Honor just
9 intimated, 28 U.S.C. 1257, in conjunction with the
10 Rooker-Feldman doctrine and its case law, requires that the
11 plaintiff has exhausted her appeals up to the state forum's
12 highest court before applying only to the Supreme Court of the
13 United States in order to redress these grievances that she's
14 sued the defendant on in this court at the trial level.

15 Plaintiff has submitted no opposition to our motion.
16 As stated in terms of our 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss pursuant
17 to lack of subject matter jurisdiction, it is the plaintiff's
18 burden to show that this Court maintains subject matter
19 jurisdiction.

20 Your Honor, the plaintiff is asking this Court to
21 second-guess procedures by the Michigan state court and the
22 New Jersey state courts --

23 THE COURT: So let's talk about Michigan. What
24 happened in Michigan?

25 MR. WURGAFT: In Michigan, Your Honor, there was a

1 trial. There was an order issued awarding the plaintiff in
2 that case -- the defendant here -- damages. There was an
3 order awarding the plaintiff in that case -- the defendant
4 here -- attorney's fees and judgment entered in the amount of
5 approximately \$16,900. Something like that.

6 THE COURT: Was there an appeal?

7 MR. WURGAFT: There was no appeal, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Go ahead.

9 MR. WURGAFT: I apologize.

10 THE COURT: And then that judgment was domesticated
11 in New Jersey?

12 MR. WURGAFT: Even before that, Your Honor, the
13 defendant had made a motion -- I believe it was through
14 counsel -- in Michigan for a summary disposition addressing
15 some of the claims that she now seeks to have redressed by
16 this court. That motion was denied in Michigan. As Your
17 Honor stated, that judgment, the Michigan judgment, was then
18 duly domesticated in the state of New Jersey. Challenges were
19 brought by the plaintiff in this case. They were rejected at
20 the trial court level. They were not appealed and then this
21 action followed.

22 As the Court has stated, the plaintiff in this case was
23 required to -- even before New Jersey -- appeal the judgment
24 in the state of Michigan, which she did not do. The judgment
25 was then domesticated in New Jersey. The challenges that were

1 denied were also not appealed in the state of New Jersey. And
2 now we're in a court that lacks jurisdiction to hear the
3 plaintiff's matters.

4 Our papers are clear. Your Honor has stated the law.
5 It's our position that the Plaintiff continues to abuse this
6 court in this lawsuit and that it must be dismissed.

7 THE COURT: And the bankruptcy filing is just of no
8 consequence?

9 MR. WURGAFT: Pretty much. I mean, it stayed our
10 efforts to collect on our judgment but then was voluntarily
11 dismissed.

12 THE COURT: Ma'am, would you like to be heard?

13 MS. MCLEAN: Yes. For the record, I'd like to find
14 out the statements that were made. Is his being -- Mr.
15 Wurgaft is a counsel for affiant. Is that affiant present in
16 the court? Because I'm just -- I'm just trying to understand
17 the process here that there's a notice sent out that these
18 statements are being made for an affiant that is supposed to
19 be in this courtroom.

20 THE COURT: Ma'am, let me ask you this. Was there a
21 trial in Michigan?

22 MS. MCLEAN: Sir, I'm trying to move forward, but I'd
23 like to know who is my accuser. So, yes, there was something
24 in Michigan and there was no affiant there either. There's
25 never been anyone that made these statements against me.

1 THE COURT: But you appeared in Michigan, correct,
2 ma'am?

3 MS. MCLEAN: There was a special appearance in
4 Michigan, yes, there was, but there was no one there that ever
5 filed a complaint against me. There's been no one that filed
6 a complaint against me. The statements that are being made, I
7 would like to know where they are coming from, who are making
8 these statements? Who brought me to where I'm a disposition
9 right now? So I'd like to, before I proceed, know who is
10 making these statements against me.

11 THE COURT: Ma'am, I don't understand your question.
12 As I understand the record, there was a trial in Michigan that
13 ultimately resulted in a judgment against you. There was no
14 appeal from that judgment. That judgment was then
15 domesticated in New Jersey. You filed a complaint in New
16 Jersey that you lost and there was no appeal from that
17 judgment either. Is that a correct statement?

18 MR. WURGAFT: Yes, Your Honor. Yes.

19 THE COURT: Thanks.

20 MS. MCLEAN: Is Mr. Wurgaft going to be sworn in to
21 make statements against me? Because he's testifying against
22 me. And I'd also like to know, sir, is this a court of
23 record? Are you a constitutional Article III judge? Is this
24 the right court that I'm in here? Is this a federal court of
25 an Article III judge? Is this a court of record? Do you have

1 an oath to the constitution? Can you please put that for the
2 record?

3 THE COURT: I'm not going to answer your questions,
4 ma'am.

5 MS. MCLEAN: Oh, okay.

6 THE COURT: Counsel is arguing based on the record.

7 MS. MCLEAN: Okay. So this is not a constitutional
8 Article III court, a court of record?

9 THE COURT: You can draw whatever inference you would
10 like, ma'am. Would you like to be heard in opposition to the
11 motion?

12 MS. MCLEAN: So there's not going to be an affiant so
13 Mr. Wurgaft is making testimony against me on -- as being an
14 affiant. Is there someone that has made these statements that
15 Mr. Wurgaft, counsel, who is going to be put for the record as
16 who is making these statements? A born, alive, someone --
17 actually a living, breathing person that is making statements
18 that brought me to this court that has a judgment against me.
19 That's why I'm in this court. Is there a living person to be
20 put on record?

21 MR. WURGAFT: Your Honor, the plaintiff brought
22 herself to this court by filing this lawsuit, number one.
23 Number two, as the Court is aware --

24 MS. MCLEAN: I object under 801 hearsay.

25 THE COURT: Wait, wait. Ma'am, please don't

1 interrupt him.

2 MR. WURGAFT: Your Honor, again, the plaintiff
3 brought herself to this court by filing this lawsuit. She is
4 the plaintiff. In terms of representation, I represent a
5 client. A client has hired me to represent their interests.
6 I am here authorized to speak on their behalf. I am not sure
7 what the plaintiff is referring to as far as affiant. She may
8 be confusing criminal prosecution with civil matters. I'm
9 really not sure. But at its base, these are efforts to delay
10 this hearing and to delay the inevitable, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 Ma'am, would you like to address the merits of the
13 motion?

14 MS. MCLEAN: Yes, I will. I don't know how to
15 proceed if I don't know who is making statements against me.

16 THE COURT: Ma'am, did you read the motion that was
17 filed by the defendant?

18 MS. MCLEAN: Sir, who's making statements against me?

19 THE COURT: I've heard enough.

20 MS. MCLEAN: For the record, please.

21 THE COURT: Understood. Before this is Court is the
22 defendant's motion to dismiss. The Court has set forth the
23 factual record upon which --

24 MS. MCLEAN: Sir --

25 THE COURT: Ma'am, I'm speaking.

1 MS. MCLEAN: Sir, I'm --

2 THE COURT: The Court -- ma'am, please, I am
3 speaking. If you would like to address the merits of the
4 motion, I will hear you. If you insist on who the affiant is,
5 we are past that point. Counsel is -- ma'am, please. Counsel
6 is arguing based on the record. You have an opportunity to
7 oppose this motion, and I will entertain your verbal
8 opposition now. If you are going to insist on asking this
9 Court whether or not it is constitutionally qualified, I am
10 not going to proceed on that track. If you are going to
11 insist on asking who the affiant is, I am not going to proceed
12 on that track. If you would like to argue the merits of the
13 motion, I will entertain that argument. Would you like to
14 argue the merits of the motion?

15 MS. MCLEAN: Sir, I would proceed to the best of my
16 ability. I will begin with, for the record, this comment,
17 civil rights of procedure, diversity of jurisdiction, chapter
18 5 where it states there is no place to start like the
19 beginning and the usual beginning for the defendant is receipt
20 of a summons from the court with an order to appear and defend
21 a lawsuit. It is never a prospect that invokes such
22 enthusiasm but the reception is likely to be even chillier if
23 the suit has been filed in a distant state.

24 The defendant will want to know why on earth the
25 plaintiff was chosen to sue in a court a thousand miles away

1 and perhaps, more to the point, whether she can sue there.
2 The answer to the second question lies surrounded in one of
3 the foggiest realms of civil procedure. The doctrine of
4 personal jurisdiction even since the landmark case of *Pennoyer*
5 v. -- that's spelled P-E-N-N-O-Y-E-R -- v. *Neff*, N-E-F-F, 95
6 U.S. 714 (1877), the Supreme Court has continuously held that
7 plaintiffs are not free to bring suit wherever they choose.
8 The Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution
9 forbids the state from depriving any person of life, liberty
10 or property without due process of law. A state would violate
11 this guarantee if it occurs entering judgment against
12 defendants who follow a fair judicial procedure. And fair
13 procedure includes not only such traditional elements as the
14 right to counsel or to cross-examine witnesses, but also
15 appropriate limits on the place where a defendant can be
16 required to defend a lawsuit. This was not adhered to in my
17 case.

18 Also in chapter 5, diversity of jurisdiction, it says
19 one of the major categories of cases that the framers
20 authorize federal courts to hear is the so-called diversity
21 jurisdiction described in Article III, section 2, as cases
22 between citizens of different states. In diversity cases as
23 in some others -- in Article III, section 2, the subject
24 matter jurisdiction of the federal courts is defined by who
25 the parties to the suit are rather than the subject matter of

1 the underlying dispute. The plaintiff in a diversity case may
2 seek recovery on a battery theory, a fraud claim, a right
3 created by the state.

4 I am saying that the court that this matter was heard
5 in, that it began deliberately in the wrong court to cause me
6 damages. My -- my suit in this court is about whether or not
7 that court was the right court. The information shows that it
8 should have been -- since I was never in Michigan and I never
9 had a business there, that the court should have been a
10 federal court and that adhered to diversity of citizenship
11 clause.

12 I did put a writ in to defendant's counsel that -- to
13 show that that was the right court because they -- that was my
14 cause of action because they did not put on record whether or
15 not that court was authorized to adjudicate in -- in that case
16 has not been put on record and has still not been put on
17 record what was the jurisdiction of that court beside. That
18 has still not been known. I have challenged jurisdiction. It
19 has not been responded to and this is the reason why I'm here
20 because information showed that this is the court this -- if
21 this is an Article III court that I am in, that this is the
22 court that would hear this matter.

23 The rules of this court is -- of procedure is that
24 original signature required of an affiant, insurance of
25 summons, service of summons. I never received a summons to go

1 to that court. Personal service, judges' oaths, attorneys'
2 oath, verification of pleadings. Affiant is competent to
3 testify. There's not been a person that has signed a
4 certificate against me or responded to this court. So that's
5 one of the points I was bringing up. Everything that was
6 presented has not been by a board member or officer of that
7 court. That is the reason I was trying to ask whether or not
8 there is an actual person that is making claims against me.

9 The rules of the court procedures on any form of
10 relationship between the judge, any one of parties. There's
11 also rules of the court. Fifteen rules of procedure mandate a
12 corporation, officer or board member of such is a party in
13 standing. I'm here because this court is a court that is of
14 diverse citizenship which means I am from New Jersey and that
15 court is from Michigan. It is a local municipal court and I
16 am trying to get the laws that that court is allowed to reach
17 into New Jersey and seize property in -- from Michigan to
18 seize property in New Jersey. The question of jurisdiction,
19 there is no discretion to ignore the lack of jurisdiction.
20 See *Joyce v. U.S.* 747 F.2d. 215. The universal -- at the
21 universal principle as old as the law is that a proceeding of
22 a court without jurisdiction are a nullity and this judgment
23 therefore without effect either on person or property. See
24 *Norwood v. Renfield* 34 C 329.

25 *Parte, P-A-R-T-E, Giambonini, G-I-A-M-B-O-N-I-N-I, 49 P*

1 72. The argument that's brought up that there is no appeal,
2 it was based on no response as to the jurisdiction of that
3 court beside it was not a court that had authority to go ahead
4 and adjudicate against me. It did -- was not a federal court
5 that adhered to diversity of citizenship. Therefore,
6 beginning in the wrong court would put me in the wrong court
7 of appeals. So even if I were -- had the money or to -- or
8 could afford to go to Michigan and appeal it, it would have
9 been overturned because it would have been in the wrong court.
10 It did not start at the federal level so, therefore, the
11 appeal could only be in a court that would have not been the
12 correct court.

13 I'm here today to defend that -- that there has never
14 been any law put on record from the -- from the counsel for
15 whoever this claimant is that that court was the correct
16 court. That has not been addressed as whether or not that
17 court was a diversity of citizenship court. The subpoena,
18 that was not expressed in the first hearing about injunctive
19 relief. This is the proof of the subpoena that if I do not
20 answer there's highlighting that I will be jailed, a warrant
21 for the defendant's arrest may issue out of the court without
22 further notice. So there is danger of me being in jail if I
23 do not give this subpoena dated November 16th, for the record.
24 It says I have to give them my Social Security number. I have
25 to give all my bank accounts. Information about my car, any

1 assets. And the track is that they are going to sweep my bank
2 accounts which means I will have no money to basically
3 survive. I will have no money to take care of my family. And
4 this is a danger that I'm looking at. I am not sure how I'm
5 going to survive if they will be sweeping my accounts for any
6 money that I receive.

7 So this was not mentioned in the first hearing and this
8 is what I wanted to bring forth as injunctive relief to hold
9 until this case move forward. That's one of the main things.
10 I have been trying to get information about who are these
11 people since I don't know exactly who they are. I sent a
12 question asking them for response. That has not been
13 responded to. I don't know who exactly is filing these claims
14 against me. That has never been disclosed. I also gave a
15 writ to the counselor to identify what are the -- what are the
16 laws that was able to put that judgment against me if no one
17 ever filed a claim against me, if I've never received a
18 summons. All of these were violations of my constitutional
19 rights to due process.

20 I went to a court that they have not shown any -- had
21 any jurisdiction to proceed and also did not have the subject
22 matter jurisdiction to proceed and to seize the property in
23 New Jersey. The jurisdiction writ of challenge with an
24 affidavit was sent on October 30th and it highlights that this
25 is a jurisdictional writ affidavit. It's Ruth McLean by

1 limited appearance to the matter in the court of record with
2 clean hands without prejudice and with all rights reserved
3 under the UCC1-308 in dealing with this court in proper
4 persona. Not pro se. Have not seen any evidence that proves
5 they have a liability for the all-capital-letter name above to
6 challenge the persona and chetal subject matter jurisdiction.

7 The court -- the Supreme Court case of 1795 *Penhallow*
8 -- I'll have to spell it -- P-E-N-H-A-L-L-O-W v. D-O-A-N-E,
9 Administrators highlighted 3 U.S. 54 LI at ED 573 D-A-L-L 546
10 defines governments. Governments are corporations in as much
11 every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and
12 a preacher of the mind only. A government can interfere only
13 with other artificial persons. This is the first page that
14 I'm trying to read. In response from the party petitioner,
15 plaintiff asserted proper jurisdiction throughout this case
16 must be made on a point by point basis for all the moving
17 party petitioner plaintiff actions, filings and motions are
18 true and correct in relation to proper state laws, codes,
19 rules, regulation, statutes used to conduct this case that
20 proper jurisdiction was always maintained from the record
21 including the complete summons.

22 None of this was done in this case. Even if I had
23 gone, had the funds, it would have been the wrong appeal
24 court. That was not going to be something that would have
25 heard in that court. It would have been dismissed. Legal

1 advice told me to wait until this matter was here in Jersey to
2 address it. Even when I tried to address it, that was even
3 the wrong court. That was not a federal level court that was
4 able to hear these hearings. This is the reason I am here now
5 because according to my research this is the right court at
6 this point that has not been verified. I have asked a
7 question and it has not been verified. So this is the reason
8 I'm here now because nothing has been on record as to the
9 jurisdiction of the Michigan court to preside. I -- I -- I
10 believe that based on everything -- and it's not been
11 confirmed -- that's why I asked for this writ, that that court
12 has violated my rights to the -- the constitutional rights of
13 due process due to not putting on record their jurisdiction to
14 proceed based on affidavits that was sent saying that I lived
15 in Plainfield. That I never did. There was no summons that
16 was ever given to me. Based on there's no claim that has ever
17 submitted a signed affidavit or certificate showing that I
18 have caused them damage. All of this was damage to my rights
19 to due process on the Constitution of America.

20 THE COURT: Okay. I understand your argument.

21 Before this Court is the defendant's motion for a
22 dismissal under 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). The Court has set
23 forth on the record the necessary facts. The Court has heard
24 the argument of defense counsel and has read and heard the
25 arguments of the plaintiff.

1 There are three things that are clear. Number one,
2 there was a trial in Michigan that resulted in a judgment
3 against the plaintiff. There was no appeal taken from that
4 judgment. Number two, that judgment was domesticated in New
5 Jersey. The plaintiff fought that judgment in New Jersey.
6 Lost in state court. There was no appeal taken. Three, there
7 was a bankruptcy filed in New Jersey that was voluntarily
8 withdrawn by the plaintiff.

9 Based on Rooker-Feldman, this is a clear Rooker-Feldman
10 case and, therefore, this Court does not have jurisdiction.
11 The Court notes plaintiff's opposition contesting the
12 jurisdiction in Michigan. That was an issue that could have
13 been raised and should have been raised in Michigan, not
14 before this Court. The plaintiff seems to conflate diversity
15 jurisdiction for federal court versus a proceeding in state
16 court in Michigan. The plaintiff is referring to a subpoena,
17 which I am gleaning is an application seeking the plaintiff's
18 assets because the plaintiff does have a judgment against her
19 which was a Michigan judgment properly domesticated in the
20 state of New Jersey.

21 Accordingly, for those reasons, the defendant's motion
22 is granted. This complaint is dismissed. The Court notes
23 that there were some applications made by the plaintiff.
24 Counsel on January 2nd, 2020 filed an opposition to those
25 filings. That's document number 27. The relief requested is

1 that the motions be terminated. Plaintiff did not comply with
2 the local rules. Accordingly, that application is granted.
3 The Court will enter a so ordered order terminating those
4 motions. And document number 27, the Court will request
5 defendant to please submit a form of judgment for the reasons
6 set forth on the record granting this relief. The case is
7 closed.

8 MR. WURGAFT: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Thank you. Good luck, ma'am.

10 (Court concludes at 10:30 a.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE.

- - - - -

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

I

/S/ Megan McKay-Soule, RMR, CRR

March 27, 2020

Court Reporter

Date